



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,875	11/12/2001	Masatake Ohmori	2271/65635-A	4086

7590 04/18/2006

RICHARD F. JAWORSKI
Cooper & Dunham LLP
1185 Avenue of the Americas
New York, NY 10036

EXAMINER

BRINICH, STEPHEN M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2625

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

20060406

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/010,875	OHMORI, MASATAKE	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Stephen M. Brinich	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-57 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 17-26 and 28-57 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15, 16 and 27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2625

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

2. Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Applicant's described Prior Art.

Re claims 15-16, Applicant's described Prior Art (page 2, line 5 - page 4, line 19, particularly page 4, lines 10-12; Figures 1A-1B) describes a system for reducing the size of a binary image in a sub-scanning direction using a conditional OR process, so as to thin out a line immediately after the thinning point. The recitation of "a limiting component that limits a size-change point... to an odd-number line or an even-number line" as written does not appear to restrict the scope of the claim, inasmuch as any point is necessarily on either an odd-number line or an even-number line.

Art Unit: 2625

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's described Prior Art.

Re claim 27, Applicant's described Prior Art describes pixel reduction in one direction, rather than in both horizontal and vertical directions.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use the described Prior Art arrangement to reduce in image in both directions (one necessarily following the other; the two possible orders being a matter of choice among equivalents obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art if the specific selection was not to solve a known problem in the art, per *In re Ruff* (118 USPQ 343)).

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to produce an image reduced in both directions, thus allowing the

Art Unit: 2625

final image to retain the same shape as the original by equal reduction both horizontally and vertically.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to apply Applicant's described Prior Art to reduce the image in a scanning direction, then in a sub-scanning direction, to obtain the invention as specified in claims 13 & 27.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 1-14, 17-26, & 28-57 are allowed.

6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Re claim 1 (and dependent claims 1 & 13), the art of record does not teach or suggest the recited thin-out flag arrangement for an odd line or an even line on the basis of the even line or odd line location of a size-change point in conjunction with the recited arrangement for binary image reduction.

Re claims 3, 8, 17, 22, 32, & 51 (and dependent claims 4-7, 9-12, 18-21, 23-26, 33-36, & 52-55), the art of record does not teach or suggest the recited selective processing depending on whether an odd-numbered or even-numbered line is being processed in conjunction with the recited arrangement for binary image reduction.

Re claims 30, 37, 44, & 46 (and dependent claims 31, 38-43, 45, & 47-50, & 56-57), the art of record does not teach or

Art Unit: 2625

suggest the recited line memory arrangements in conjunction with the recited arrangement for binary image reduction.

Re claims 14 & 28, the art of record does not teach or suggest the recited selective use of simple thinning out followed by conditional OR processing when reduction is 50 percent or below in conjunction with the recited arrangement for binary image reduction.

Re claim 29, the art of record does not teach or suggest the recited selective discard of data from a line memory when a current process line is other than the size-change point in conjunction with the recited arrangement for binary image reduction.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments, see Response filed 2/1/06 (page 22, line 12 - page 23, line 3), with respect to the rejections of claims 1-2 and the objections to claims 14 & 28-29 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The rejections of claims 1-2 and the objections to claims 14 & 28-29 have been withdrawn.

8. Applicant's arguments in the Response filed 2/1/06 with respect to the rejection of claims 15-16 & 27 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Re claim 15 (and dependent claims 16 & 27), Applicant argues (page 21, line 15 - page 22, line 8) that the background

Art Unit: 2625

art discussed in the Related Art section of the present specification does not disclose or suggest reducing the size of the binary image in a sub-scanning direction using a conditional OR process and limiting a size-change point to one of an odd-number line or an even-number line.

Re the former point, the Related Art section of the present specification describes (page 4, lines 10-12) reducing the size of the binary image in a sub-scanning direction using a conditional OR process.

Re the latter point, as noted above, the current language reciting "limiting" a size-change point to one of an odd-number line or an even-number line does not actually "limit" the size-change point at all, inasmuch as any line is either an odd-number line or an even-number line.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS

Art Unit: 2625

of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning the contents of this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Brinich at 571-272-7430.

Any inquiry relating to the status of this application or proceeding or any inquiry of a general nature concerning application processing should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 Customer Service center at 571-272-2600 or to the USPTO Contact Center at 800-786-9199 or 703-308-4357.

The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 7:00-4:30, alternate Fridays off.

The examiner's unit designation has been changed from "Art Unit 2624" to "Technology Division 2625" (as of March 20, 2006).

If attempts to contact the examiner and the Customer Service Center are unsuccessful, supervisor David Moore can be contacted at 571-272-7437.

Art Unit: 2625

Faxes pertaining to this application should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 official fax number, which is 571-273-8300 (as of July 15, 2005).

Hand-carried correspondence may be delivered to the Customer Service Window, located at the Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314.

Stephen M Brinich
Examiner
Technology Division 2625

smb *SMB*
April 10, 2006



THOMAS D. LEE

